/ıN

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,818	05/30/2001	Young-Jun Yoon	POU920000086US1	6631

7590 10/20/2005

William Kinnaman, Jr.
IBM Corporation,
Intellectual Property Law Department
2455 South Road, M/S P386
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

EXAMINER	
HWANG, JOON H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/867,818	YOON, YOUNG-JUN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joon H. Hwang	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 July 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments, see "argument" section on pages 4-6, filed in the Appeal Brief received on 7/7/05, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 12, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Miller et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0059728).

The pending claims are 1-30.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 30 is objected to because of the following informalities: "The program storage device of claim 12" in 1st line of claim 30 should be "The program storage device of claim 20". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 12-16, 20-24, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miller et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0059728).

With respect to claim 1, Miller teaches retrieving data from a selected one of a plurality of databases in a system in which hypertext requests are issued from a client side to a server side (i.e., a user sends hypertext requests via a user interface of a standard web browser from a client side to a server side in order to retrieve data from a

specified database, section 11 on page 1, sections 23, 25, and 27 on page 2, section 29 on page 3, fig. 1, and fig. 2). Miller teaches a plurality of browser components on said server side, each of which is operable to retrieve data from a corresponding one of said databases (i.e., translators, fig. 1, sections 13 and 22 on page 2, and sections 33-34 on page 3). Miller teaches means for receiving, at a location on said server side that is common to said databases, a hypertext request from a requester on said client side specifying data contained in one of said database (i.e., the control engine on the server side that is common to databases, fig.1, section 12 on pages 1-2, and section 41 on page 4). Miller teaches means responsive to receiving said request for directing said request from said common location to the browser component corresponding to said one of said databases to permit said browser component to retrieve the data specified in said request (i.e., the control engine forwards the request to the appropriate translators, fig.1, section 12 on pages 1-2, and section 41 on page 4).

With respect to claim 2, Miller teaches said request specifies one of said browser components, said means responsive to receiving said request directing said request to the browser component specified in said request (i.e., the control engine forwards the request to the specified translators, fig.1, fig. 2, section 11 on page 1, section 12 on pages 1-2, sections 23, 25, and 27 on page 2, and section 41 on page 4).

With respect to claim 3, Miller teaches said means responsive to receiving said request generates a common portion of a hypertext reply to said requester (i.e., the control engine consolidates results received from the translators and formats the consolidated results in HTML, section 32 on page 3 and fig. 3).

With respect to claim 6, Miller teaches each of said browser components generates a browser-specific portion of a hypertext reply to said requester (i.e., the translator encodes search results in HTML and creates a number of summary statistics and records and corresponding hyperlinks, section 37 on page 3, section 38 on pages 3-4, and section 43 on page 4).

With respect to claim 7, Miller teaches each of said browser components has a translator component associated therewith, said translator component intermediating between said browser component and said database and generating a request-specific portion of said browser-specific portion of said hypertext reply to said requester (i.e., the translator has translation capability and encodes result records and corresponding hyperlinks in HTML, fig. 1, sections 13 and 22 on page 2, sections 33-34 and 37 on page 3, section 38 on pages 3-4, and section 43 on page 4).

With respect to claim 8, Miller teaches said browser component generates a non-request-specific portion of said browser-specific portion of said hypertext reply to said requester (i.e., translator encodes a number of summary statistics in HTML, section 37 on page 3, section 38 on pages 3-4, and section 43 on page 4).

With respect to claim 28, Miller teaches means for sending a response back to said requester from said common location (i.e., the control engine forwards the results to the user, fig. 1, section 32 on page 3, and section 39 on page 4).

The limitations of claims 12 and 20 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claims 13 and 21 are rejected in the analysis of claim 2 above,

and these claims are rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claims 14 and 22 are rejected in the analysis of claim 6 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claims 15 and 23 are rejected in the analysis of claim 7 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claims 16 and 24 are rejected in the analysis of claim 8 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claims 29 and 30 are rejected in the analysis of claim 28 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0059728) in view of Kromann (U.S. Patent No. 6,766,313).

With respect to claims 4 and 5, Miller discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above except a header and a footer portion of a common portion. However, Kromann discloses constructing a HTML reply including a header, requested information, and a footer, wherein the header and the footer may contain any information, such as advertisements (lines 15-30 in col. 1, lines 8-27 in col. 2, lines 45-60 in col. 5, and lines 13-54 in col. 6) in order to provide additional information that may

be useful to a user. Therefore, based on Miller in view of Kromann, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Kromann to the system of Miller in order to provide additional information that may be useful to a user.

7. Claims 9-10, 17-18, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0059728) in view of Houlding (U.S. Patent No. 6,735,771).

With respect to claims 9 and 10, Miller teaches the claimed subject matter as discussed above except an interface repository and a database storing naming contexts. However, Houlding teaches an interface repository and a database storing naming contexts (i.e., CORBA Interface Repository and CORBA Naming Service, fig. 2, abstract, lines 29-49 in col. 4, lines 4-18 and 44-67 in col. 5, and lines 1-7 in col. 6) in order to provide services provided by objects in the databases to a user. Therefore, based on Miller in view of Houlding, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Houlding to the system of Miller in order to provide services provided by objects in the databases to a user.

The limitations of claims 17-18 and 25-26 are rejected in the analysis of claims 9-10 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

8. Claims 11, 19, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0059728) in view of Sonderegger (U.S. Patent No. 5,893,118).

With respect to claim 11, Miller teaches the claimed subject matter as discussed above except a database storing Java classes. However, Sonderegger teaches a database storing Java classes (abstract and lines 16-24 in col. 5) in order to provide services provided by Java objects to a user. Therefore, based on Miller in view of Sonderegger, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Sonderegger to the system of Miller in order to provide services provided by Java objects to a user.

The limitations of claims 19 and 27 are rejected in the analysis of claim 11 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joon H. Hwang whose telephone number is 571-272-4036. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00(M~F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joon Hwang
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

10/14/05